

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed on 9 July 2008, the Examiner objected to claims 5 and 22-25 for informalities. In response, applicants have amended claims 22 and 25 to cure the informalities. Claims 5, 23, and 24 have been canceled, thereby mooted the objections thereto. Applicants therefore request that the objections to claims 5 and 22-25 be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 2-9 and 22-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. patent no. 5,519,861 (Ryu et al.) in view of U.S. patent no. 6,279,021 (Takano et al.) and U.S. patent no. 6,505,190 (Harel et al.). In response, applicants have amended the independent claims 4 and 22 to recite the invention with greater specificity. These amendments make claims 5-8 and 23-24 superfluous, and so they have been canceled.

The claims as amended recite register(s) comprising a ring buffer for simultaneously storing a set of a plurality of received data points of a corresponding time series. None of the references alone or in combination teach a register comprising a ring buffer. For example, databases do not use ring buffers; therefore, Ryu et al. is inapplicable. The registers of Takano et al. each store a single data point of their corresponding time series at any one time. And Harel et al. does not discuss registers.

Claim 4 as amended recites register(s) further comprising one or more windows each corresponding to a subset of the set of the received data points of the register's corresponding time series and wherein the subset changes with each received data point of the corresponding time series, each window for maintaining statistics for the corresponding subset and updating the statistics via online computation to account for data points of the corresponding time series moving into and out of the corresponding subset. Claim 22 as amended contains like recitations. None of the references alone or in combination teach windows as recited in the claims. For example, the windows of Ryu et al. are display windows which display subsets of time series data in graphical form. The subsets

do not change with each received data point of their corresponding time series. Nor are statistics for the subsets maintained, much less updated. Takano et al. merely disclose registers without windows and without corresponding statistics. And Harel et al. do not discuss windows at all. Furthermore, none of the references disclose computing window statistics via online computation (note that “online computation” is a term of art –see application page 2, last two lines, to page 3, first line).

Claim 4 as amended further recites that at least one persistent query defines an event condition and a payload specification, at least one of which is a function of the statistics of at least one window of at least one of the corresponding one or more trigger registers. Claim 22 has like recitations. None of the references alone or in combination teach persistent queries such as are characterized in the claim recitations. For example, the queries of Ryu et al. are one-time queries and not persistent queries. Also, neither the event condition nor the payload specification of the queries of Ryu et al. is a function of statistics of a corresponding register’s window. The event conditions and payload specifications of Harel et al. are likewise not a function of statistics of a register’s window. And Takano et al. do not discuss queries, persistent or otherwise.

For any and all of the reasons specified above, Ryu et al., Takano et al., and Harel et al. do not disclose, teach or suggest applicants’ invention as claimed. Applicants therefore request that the §103(a) rejection of their claims as amended be withdrawn.

The Examiner's objection and rejection having been properly addressed and disposed of, applicants assert that the application is now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore request that the application be reconsidered and thereafter be passed to issue.

Applicants believe the foregoing to be dispositive of all issues in the application. But, if the Examiner should deem that a telephone interview would advance prosecution, then applicants request the Examiner to call their attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric T. Bax
Joseph G. Billock
Ian D. Swett

By _____
Douglas M. Grover
Corporate Counsel
Reg. No. 52,974
303-538-4926

Date: _____

Avaya Inc.
Docket Administrator
307 Middletown-Lincroft Road
Room 1N-391
Lincroft, NJ 07738